

The Second Law of Steady State Thermodynamics for Nonequilibrium Quantum Dynamics

Satoshi Yukawa*

*Department of Applied Physics,
School of Engineering, The University of Tokyo,
Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan*

(Dated: February 6, 2008)

The second law of ordinary thermodynamics and the second law of steady state thermodynamics, as proposed by Oono and Paniconi, are investigated from the microscopic point of view for the open quantum system. Based on the H-theorem of Lindblad, we show that both second laws are consistent with the quantum dynamics generated by the completely positive map. In addition, microscopic expressions of entropy production and “housekeeping heat” are obtained for some classes of dynamical quantum systems.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.30.-d

Understanding the properties of nonequilibrium states of quantum systems may become important for developing quantum devices which perform efficiently in nonequilibrium situations; It is known, for instance, that quantum ratchet systems only work in competitive situations between thermal relaxation and external driving[1, 2, 3]. A theoretical framework for considering the general properties of nonequilibrium states, however, is still under development.

In this letter we focus our attention on thermodynamic properties of steady states in nonequilibrium quantum dynamics, especially the second law of steady state thermodynamics. The steady state thermodynamics (SST) proposed by Oono and Paniconi[4] is a phenomenological thermodynamic framework for the steady state instead of thermal equilibrium. The second law of SST is not simple because the steady state produces heat constantly; In such a situation the total heat is divergent. Therefore the meaning of heat in the second law of SST is ambiguous. Oono and Paniconi introduced a concept of “excess heat” to resolve this confusing situation. The excess heat is defined by subtracting “housekeeping heat” from the total heat; The housekeeping heat is defined as the energy preventing steady states from thermal relaxation. Then the excess heat for the steady state becomes finite and we can discuss the second law with this excess heat. There are still ambiguities; How do we determine other thermodynamic quantities operationally? What are microscopic expressions of such quantities? In this letter we consider microscopic quantum descriptions; Especially we treat some classes of small open quantum systems and thermodynamic processes for such systems. As a consequence we discuss the second law of SST for nonequilibrium quantum dynamics of small open quantum systems.

Our strategy is as follows: First we clarify how the equilibrium thermodynamics is consistent with the

nonequilibrium quantum dynamics. Next we extend this result to the nonequilibrium steady state case. Mathematically this operation has no ambiguity for some limiting class of the system. Finally we discuss the validity of our expression.

The present quantum system we consider consists of three parts; One is a main system with a time-varying field. This part is operated from the outside. The time-varying field acts like, for instance, a piston in a cylinder. Our interest is concentrated on this part. We write its Hamiltonian as $H(t)$ or H_λ explicitly representing the time-dependent field $\lambda(t)$. Here we assume that the system is sufficiently small. The second part of the whole system is a heat bath. It is so large that it is always in thermal equilibrium with a definite temperature (we denote its inverse temperature as β). The last part is an interaction between the first two. The coupling constant γ governs the relaxation time of the system. In the present study we assume that the coupling is sufficiently weak. This assumption ensures the independency of the small system from the heat bath. Then we can discuss the thermodynamic properties of the small system. It should be noted that a temperature of the small system cannot be defined in its nonequilibrium state. We only mention its temperature in the thermal equilibrium state by the corresponding heat bath temperature β .

A thermodynamic process for the present study is described in the following way; At the initial time, a density operator of the small system is taken to be in thermal equilibrium. From this state we operate the field λ from 0 to 1 (these values can be chosen arbitrary without loss of generality) in the finite time interval T . The value of T controls a property of the dynamics; If T is sufficiently shorter than the characteristic time determined by the minimal energy gap at the pseudo crossing of energy levels, the process may become nonadiabatic[15] in the quantum mechanical sense. If T is sufficiently larger than the above time scale but much smaller than the thermal relaxation time ($\sim O(\gamma^{-2})$), the adiabatic dynamics may be actualized. If T is much larger than all the above mentioned time scales, the dynamics becomes a quasi-

*Electronic address: yukawa@ap.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

equilibrium. Then the system is always in the thermal equilibrium state corresponding to the Hamiltonian H_λ .

The microscopic dynamics of the system we use here is obtained by a projection method[5]. After applying the projection method and weak coupling expansion, we obtain the equation of motion for the density operator $\rho(t)$ of the system as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H(t), \rho(t)] - \gamma^2 \Gamma_{H(t)}(\rho(t)) . \quad (1)$$

The first term represents pure quantum dynamics. The second term is a thermal relaxation term; If the Hamiltonian is independent of time, the system relaxes into the thermal equilibrium state. The result of this letter is, however, independent of the details of dynamics. Only the (1) existence of the equilibrium or nonequilibrium steady states and the (2) special features of the dynamics mentioned in latter part is important.

Let us define thermodynamic quantities in the present situation. First we define the internal energy. It can be regarded as the expectation value of the Hamiltonian under the assumption that the system is small. In the present thermodynamic process we can write a total change of the internal energy ΔE as

$$\Delta E \equiv \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\dot{\lambda}} \frac{\partial \langle H_\lambda \rangle_t}{\partial t} = \langle H_1 \rangle_T - \langle H_0 \rangle_0 ,$$

where $\dot{\lambda}$ is the time derivative of λ and $\langle \dots \rangle_t$ represents $\text{Tr}(\dots \rho(t))$.

The total work W done by the external field during the process is defined as

$$W \equiv \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\dot{\lambda}} \left\langle \frac{\partial H_\lambda}{\partial t} \right\rangle_t ,$$

that is, the work is the summation of the average value of the change of the Hamiltonian with respect to λ [6, 7]. This definition of work is dependent on the thermodynamic process in contrast to the change of the internal energy.

Using ΔE and W , we can define the “heat” ΔQ in this context as

$$\Delta Q \equiv \Delta E - W .$$

This quantity represents the net energy coming from the heat bath. It is written by microscopic variables as

$$\Delta Q = -\frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\dot{\lambda}} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} \ln \rho^{eq}(t) \right) ,$$

where $\rho^{eq}(t) = \exp(-\beta H(t)) / \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H(t))$ is the thermal equilibrium density matrix.

The definition of the entropy is not clear, because the entropy is a concept in an equilibrium state, not a dynamical state. Therefore we need some definitions of entropy. Here we use the von Neumann entropy:

$$S(t) = -\text{Tr} \rho(t) \ln \rho(t) . \quad (2)$$

This definition is consistent with the equilibrium statistical mechanics. However it is not trivial whether this is valid for nonequilibrium dynamical states; For instance, the von Neumann entropy neither increases nor decreases for any nonadiabatic process represented by unitary evolutions, even though classical thermodynamics states that the entropy increases. In order to treat this paradoxical situation, one frequently takes the partial trace for the microscopic degrees of freedom[8]. This process is called a “coarse-graining”. In the present case, the explicit coarse-graining is not suitable because the system has a few degrees of freedom; It is not clear which degrees of freedom are traced out. Instead, because of the non-unitary evolution, the effect of the coarse-graining is introduced naturally in Eq. (2). We obtain the change of entropy during the process as

$$\Delta S = \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\dot{\lambda}} \frac{\partial S(t)}{\partial t} = S(T) - S(0) .$$

Now we can write the energy conservation as

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (\Delta S - \Delta \epsilon) = \Delta Q , \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta \epsilon$ is calculated as

$$\Delta \epsilon = \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\dot{\lambda}} \text{Tr} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} (\ln \rho^{eq}(t) - \ln \rho(t)) . \quad (4)$$

Equation (3) is the ordinary first law of thermodynamics without $\Delta \epsilon$. We can easily show that $\Delta \epsilon$ becomes zero in the quasi-equilibrium or the non-adiabatic limits. Therefore nonzero values of $\Delta \epsilon$ represent the irreversibility of the dynamics. We call $\Delta \epsilon$ “entropy production”.

If the non-negativity of $\Delta \epsilon$ can be proved, we obtain the following inequality:

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \Delta S \geq \Delta Q . \quad (5)$$

This form is quite similar to the original Clausius inequality. But there is an essential difference. In the original one the entropy difference is one of two thermal equilibrium values. By contrast ΔS in Eq. (5) is a dynamical value dependent on the process connecting two states. In addition there is no necessity that these two states are equilibrium states.

Let us consider the non-negativity of the entropy production rate $\epsilon \equiv \text{Tr} (\dot{\rho} (\ln \rho^{eq}(t) - \ln \rho(t)))$ instead of the entropy production. Roughly speaking, this term can be non-negative; If the current density operator is “larger” (“smaller”) than one corresponding to the equilibrium state, the part $\ln \rho^{eq}(t) - \ln \rho(t)$ is “less” (“grater”) than 0. If the system has normal thermodynamic stability, we can expect that the derivative $\dot{\rho}$ is negative (positive) at the same time. In this way, ϵ becomes non-negative.

For a more precise discussion, we define the following quantity:

$$d(\rho_1, \rho_2) \equiv \text{Tr} \rho_1 (\ln \rho_1 - \ln \rho_2)$$

for two arbitrary density operators ρ_1, ρ_2 . This quantity is known as a quantum relative entropy or a quantum Kullback divergence[9], which is a kind of distance between ρ_1 and ρ_2 . We can prove that the above quantity is always non-negative. If and only if $\rho_1 = \rho_2$, $d(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ vanishes. Using d , we naively rewrite ϵ as

$$\epsilon = \lim_{dt \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{dt} [d(\rho(t), \rho^{eq}(t)) - d(\rho(t+dt), \rho^{eq}(t))] .$$

Therefore the non-negativity condition of ϵ becomes

$$d(\rho(t+dt), \rho^{eq}(t)) \leq d(\rho(t), \rho^{eq}(t)) \quad (6)$$

for sufficiently small positive $dt (\ll T)$.

In 1975, Lindblad proved that the above inequality for more general cases[10]. His statement is as follows: For a completely positive map K , the inequality

$$d(K\rho_1, K\rho_2) \leq d(\rho_1, \rho_2) \quad (7)$$

holds[16]. Here ρ_1 and ρ_2 are some density matrices of the system. The completely positive map is a trace-preserving linear map keeping the positivity of the density matrices. The statement ‘‘completely’’ means that the dynamics of the system cannot be influenced by the outside and cannot influence the outside. For example, a simple unitary evolution is a completely positive map. A projected map of the unitary evolution is also a completely positive map.

Here we sketch the outlines of his proof. It is based on the following two things: (1) the joint convexity of the relative entropy[11],

$$d\left(\sum_i \lambda_i \rho_i, \sum_i \lambda_i \sigma_i\right) \leq \sum_i \lambda_i d(\rho_i, \sigma_i) , \quad (8)$$

where ρ_i, σ_i are two density matrices and λ_i are non-negative numbers restricted by $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$, and (2) the decomposition of the completely positive map K by the unitary evolution U ;

$$K\rho = \sum_U K(U)U^\dagger \rho U , \quad (9)$$

where $\sum_U K(U) = 1$, $K(U) > 0$. If we substitute Eq. (9) into the left hand side of inequality (7) and use the properties of the coefficients $K(U)$ and the joint convexity of d , we get Lindblad’s H-theorem.

In the present case our dynamics is written as a completely positive map[12, 13]. If we choose ρ_1 as $\rho(t)$, ρ_2 as $\rho^{eq}(t)$ and K as the infinitesimal time-evolution operator of the system Φ_t^{dt} , we get

$$d(\Phi_t^{dt} \rho(t), \Phi_t^{dt} \rho^{eq}(t)) \leq d(\rho(t), \rho^{eq}(t)) .$$

Since the instantaneous thermal equilibrium state $\rho^{eq}(t)$ is the invariant state of the map at time t , we obtain the inequality (6). Therefore the inequality (5) holds.

We emphasize again that the dynamical Clausius inequality (5) is dependent on a process which changes the

parameter λ . If we want to discuss the second law of thermodynamics, we have to compare the present entropy change ΔS with the quasi-equilibrium change of the entropy ΔS_{qs} . The latter is only dependent on the two equilibrium distributions of the system with $\lambda = 0, 1$. To get the usual second law, we start from the thermal equilibrium state with $\lambda = 0$ and leave the system after the switching process with $\lambda = 1$ fixed. After relaxation, the quantities ΔS and ΔE converge into quasi-equilibrium differences ΔS_{qs} and ΔE_{qs} . But the work W does not change. Then we get the Clausius inequality:

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \Delta S_{qs} \geq \Delta E_{qs} - W .$$

Let us consider the second law of steady state thermodynamics based on the knowledge of the previous consideration; Key points are the existence of the fixed point density matrix for the time-evolution map and Lindblad’s H-theorem. Mathematically it is not important whether the fixed point is a thermal equilibrium state or not. If there is a nonequilibrium steady state described by $\rho^{ss}(t)$, the system may relax into this state, not into the equilibrium state $\rho^{eq}(t)$. In such case, we can obtain a second-law analogue for the steady state by substituting $\rho^{eq}(t)$ with $\rho^{ss}(t)$, which is generally dependent on time. Then we obtain the expression of the entropy production as

$$\Delta \epsilon = \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} (\ln \rho^{ss}(t) - \ln \rho(t)) \right) + \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} (\ln \rho^{eq}(t) - \ln \rho^{ss}(t)) \right) . \quad (10)$$

We define an entropy production for the steady state as

$$\Delta \epsilon^{ss} \equiv \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} (\ln \rho^{ss}(t) - \ln \rho(t)) \right) \quad (11)$$

and define the difference of the ‘‘housekeeping’’ heat during the process as

$$\Delta Q_{hk} \equiv \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} (\ln \rho^{eq}(t) - \ln \rho^{ss}(t)) \right) . \quad (12)$$

The housekeeping heat is consumed to keep the system in the steady state, and prevent it from thermal relaxation. In the quasi-steady limit, the density operator $\rho(t)$ always follows $\rho^{ss}(t)$. Then ΔQ_{hk} can be regarded as the entropy production for the equilibrium state which is non-negative.

The corresponding first law is obtained as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (\Delta S - \Delta \epsilon^{ss}) = \Delta Q + \Delta Q_{hk} . \quad (13)$$

In the present case we can expect that the entropy production for the steady state is non-negative. Therefore the following new inequality

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \Delta S \geq \Delta Q + \Delta Q_{hk} \quad (14)$$

holds. This inequality is the second law of thermodynamics for the steady state in our present situation.

Next we will look at other expressions for the housekeeping heat and consider its properties. We denote the steady state as $\rho^{ss}(t) = \exp(-\beta(H(t) + \phi(t)))/Z^{ss}(t)$ with the steady state partition function $Z^{ss}(t) = \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta(H(t) + \phi(t)))$. $\phi(t)$ represents the nonequilibrium part of Hamiltonian. Then the housekeeping heat can be written as a fluctuation form:

$$\Delta Q_{hk} = \beta \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{\partial H(t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \phi(t)}{\partial t} \right\rangle_t^{ss} \langle \phi(t) \rangle_t^{ss} - \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial H(t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \phi(t)}{\partial t} \right) \phi(t) \right\rangle_t^{ss} \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle_t^{ss}$ represents $\text{Tr}(\dots \rho^{ss}(t))$, or more simply

$$\Delta Q_{hk} = \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \rho^{ss}(t)}{\partial t} \phi(t) \right).$$

In the quasi-steady cyclic process, the differences of entropy, energy, and entropy production for the steady state vanish. In this case, normal work and “ ϕ -work” is balanced, that is,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} \right\rangle_t^{ss} = \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \left\langle \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} \right\rangle_t^{ss}.$$

This condition imposes some restrictions on the determination of the nonequilibrium part of $\phi(t)$.

It is of note that ΔQ_{hk} is the difference of housekeeping heat for the dynamical process. If the density matrix does not depend on time, ΔQ_{hk} as defined above is strictly zero. Therefore we should consider that the present definition of housekeeping heat describes the dynamical part of total housekeeping heat; The remaining housekeeping heat cannot be calculated with the above

definition, because it is stationary with respect to time. This is not surprising, since our system is dynamical. We assume that the work done by outside is mechanical and dependent on time. Using this type of work, we cannot realize a stationary nonequilibrium steady state accompanied by housekeeping heat. We only achieve making time-dependent nonequilibrium steady states like a limit cycle or stationary nonequilibrium states without housekeeping heat.

To treat the stationary nonequilibrium steady state, we have to take into account the nonequilibrium boundary conditions such as thermal gradients or chemical potential gradients. In the present situation, however, this cannot be described by our definition of work. Therefore we need other expressions of thermodynamic quantities. If we obtain these expressions, the corresponding first and second laws may be obtained. But this is outside our scope to deal with that matter in this letter.

To summarize, we have shown that the second law of thermodynamics is consistent with microscopic quantum dynamics of open systems. In addition, for the steady state thermodynamics, it is also true that the second law in the steady-state-based thermodynamic process of the open quantum system exists. In this letter we have studied the second laws for the limited classes of open quantum system and dynamics. But similar discussions for some other systems, for instance, one with nonequilibrium boundary conditions, may be possible. Especially for classical Markov systems, the present argument is directly applicable with slight modifications[17]. For the classical Langevin system, the second law of SST also holds[14].

The author is grateful to N. Ito, M. Kikuchi, S. Miyashita, S. Sasa, K. Sekimoto, H. Tasaki for valuable discussions. The author also thanks H.-G. Matuttis for critical reading of the manuscript.

-
- [1] S. Yukawa, M. Kikuchi, G. Tatara, and H. Matsukawa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **66**, 2953 (1997).
 - [2] P. Reimann, M. Grifoni, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 10 (1997).
 - [3] G. Tatara, M. Kikuchi, S. Yukawa, and H. Matsukawa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **67**, 1090 (1998).
 - [4] Y. Oono and M. Paniconi, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **130**, 29 (1998).
 - [5] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
 - [6] A. Lenard, J. Stat. Phys. **19**, 575 (1978).
 - [7] W. Pusz and S. L. Woronowicz, Commun. Math. Phys. **58**, 273 (1978).
 - [8] D. N. Zubarev, *Nonequilibrium Statistical Thermodynamics* (Plenum, New York, 1974).
 - [9] S. Amari and H. Nagaoka, *Methods of Information Geometry*, vol. 191 of *Translations of mathematical monograph* (American Mathematical Society, 2000).
 - [10] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **40**, 147 (1975).
 - [11] E. H. Lieb, Adv. Math. **11**, 267 (1973).
 - [12] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
 - [13] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **17**, 821 (1976).
 - [14] T. Hatano and S. Sasa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3463 (2001).
 - [15] The condition that the non-adiabatic transition appears is discussed in a text book, for instance, written by A. Messiah: *quantum mechanics*, (Dover, New York, 1999)
 - [16] Classical version of this inequality can be found in the text book of information theory: T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, (Wiley, New York, 1991).
 - [17] S. Sasa, private communication